

### REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated February 21, 2008. Claims 1-31 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1, 9-13, 19, and 24 are amended as set forth above. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added with the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in accordance with the following remarks.

### Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephone interview held on July 14, 2008. Examiner Vivek Koppikar and Applicants' representatives, Terry J. Stalford and Jonathan A. Solomon, participated in the interview. In the interview Claim 1 was discussed in light of the *Feeney* and *McQuade* references. For example, Applicants discussed that *Feeney* fails to teach a central fill prescription processing subsystem coupled to, but remote from a first pharmacy prescription processing subsystem. Instead, *Feeney* teaches "a system of dispensing medication and information at the point-of-service while incorporating data management into the dispensing process." *Feeney*, ¶ 168 (emphasis added).<sup>1</sup> Further, Applicants discussed that *McQuade* fails to teach or suggest "dispensing a plurality of drugs from the central fill inventory via one or more shipments, the dispensed plurality of drugs associated with the plurality of filled prescription requests." Instead, *McQuade* teaches a system for disbursing and tracking pharmaceutical samples to pharmaceutical sales representatives and licensed practitioners, not for dispensing "filled prescription requests." *See, e.g., McQuade*, Abstract. Applicants also discussed a possible amendment to better distinguish the art.

Based on discussions with the Examiner, Applicants have amended the claims in order to clarify that the central fill prescription processing subsystem is physically remote from the pharmacy prescription processing subsystems. Support for these amendments can be found at, for example, page 4, lines 21-24 and page 5, lines 25-27 of the Present Application. Claims 9-

---

<sup>1</sup> More specifically, *Feeney* describes a medical (physician's) office that dispenses pharmaceuticals based on communications with the central system 28. The cited portions of *Feeney* explicitly recite that the dispenser 24 is "in the physician office." *Id.*, ¶ 177; *see id.*, ¶¶ 168, 175-176, 178, and 181-185.

Applicant : Kenneth A. Hill, Sr. et. al  
Serial No. : 09/996,100  
Filed : November 26, 2001  
Page : 15 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 17806-002001

13, 19, and 24, as amended, each include certain aspects analogous to Claim 1. Based on the interview and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are patentable over the cited references and request allowance.

#### Further Interview

If the Examiner thinks that a further interview would be helpful, Applicants stand ready to participate in such an interview. Terry J. Stalford can be reached at (214) 292-4088 to discuss the matter further.

Applicant : Kenneth A. Hill, Sr. et. al  
Serial No. : 09/996,100  
Filed : November 26, 2001  
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 17806-002001


CONCLUSION

In view of the above, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicants respectfully submit that the Application is in condition for allowance, and request such a Notice.

A Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time is being filed concurrently with this Reply to Office Action along with the required \$230 filing fee. If any additional extension of time is required, Applicants hereby request such extension. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 15, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Terry J. Stalford  
Reg. No. 39,522

**PTO Customer No. 26231**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street, Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 292-4088  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091